

REMARKS

The specification stands objected to for failing to provide an antecedent basis for "pressure control communication". Claim 1 has been amended to remove from the claim the term "pressure control communication." Claim 1 is amended to recite a pressure control valve communicating with a reservoir, the actuator and the clutch pack. This amendment to the claim overcomes the basis for the objection to the specification.

Claims 1 and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because Claim 1 had contained the limitation "a pressure control communication with a reservoir, the actuator, and the clutch pack valve." The cited limitation, which forms the basis for this rejection has been removed by amending Claim 1 such that it recites "a pressure control valve communicating with a reservoir, the actuator and the clutch pack," thereby removing the basis for this rejection.

The Office action states that Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. The basis for the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, as described above. In addition, Claim 1 has been further amended to include all the limitations of Claim 4, such that Claim 1 now includes all of the limitations of the base claim (Claim 1) and those of Claim 4.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite that the two-way valve is more specifically recited as a pilot valve.

Claims 5-7 depend from Claim 1; Claim 4 has been cancelled.

In view of these amendments, Claims 1, and 5-7 appear now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank McKenzie  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 29,242

Dated: March 10, 2006  
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(734) 542-0900  
(734) 542-9569 (fax)